

Comment on Hess-Philipp anti-Bell and Gill-Weihs-Zeilinger-Zukowski anti-Hess-Philipp arguments

Andrei Khrennikov

*International Center for Mathematical Modeling
in Physics and Cognitive Sciences,
University of Växjö, S-35195, Sweden¹*

Abstract

We present comparative analysis of Gill-Weihs-Zeilinger-Zukowski arguments directed against Hess-Philipp anti-Bell arguments. In general we support Hess-Philipp viewpoint to sequence of measurements in the EPR-Bohm experiments as stochastic time-like process. On the other hand, we support Gill-Weihs-Zeilinger-Zukowski arguments against the use of time-like correlations as the factor blocking the derivation of Bell-type inequalities. We presented our own time-analysis of measurements in the EPR-Bohm experiments based on the frequency approach to probability. Our analysis gives strong arguments in favour of local realism. Moreover, our frequency analysis supports the original EPR-idea that quantum mechanics is not complete.

Last two years K. Hess and W. Philipp published the series of papers in that they presented probabilistic arguments against the use of Bell's inequality [1] as the crucial argument against local realism, see [2]. On the other hand, R. Gill, G. Weihs, A. Zeilinger, M. Zukowski published preprint [3] containing rigid critique of Hess-Philipp anti-Bell considerations. We would like to analyse arguments presented by both sides as well as present our own probabilistic analysis of Bell's framework. This analysis is based on the *frequency approach* to probability theory (as an alternative to the standard measure-theoretical approach).

As it was rightly mentioned by authors of [3], publications of K. Hess and W. Philipp [2] have really drawn a lot of attention, especially since the work featured on Nature's web pages. Therefore it is very important to have the correct understanding of the role of these works in the study of Bell's arguments against local realism. First it should be noticed that investigations [2] are not at all first works containing probabilistic analysis of Bell's arguments,

¹Email: Andrei.Khrennikov@msi.vxu.se

see e.g. [4]-[7], see also book [8] on the extended bibliography. Moreover, we remark that (it may be just by chance) in all these papers, besides of one exception, namely the paper of R. Gill [7], there were obtained anti-Bell conclusions supporting local realism. We do not plan even to try to consider this huge series of probabilistic anti-Bell publications to compare with works [2]. We shall just point out main anti-Bell probabilistic arguments:

Contextualism. The probability distribution $\rho(\lambda)$ of hidden variables could not be chosen independently of experimental settings. In fact, instead of the distribution $\rho(\lambda)$ (as Bell did), we have to consider distributions $\rho_{a,b'}(\omega)$ corresponding to experimental settings a, b' . Such a dependence appears quite naturally if we assume that the general hidden variable, HV, ω contains not only the HV λ describing the state of correlated particles, but also HVs ω_a and $\omega_{b'}$ corresponding to states of Stern-Gerlach magnets with settings a and b' . Thus, in fact, HV has the form $\omega = (\omega_a, \lambda, \omega_{b'})$. This is very natural experimental assumption (see my further frequency analysis of the EPR-Bohm experiment). If we follow to contextualism it would be impossible to use Bell's representation of probabilities:

$$\mathbf{P}(A, B') = \int \rho(d\lambda) \mathbf{P}(A, B'/a, b', \lambda). \quad (1)$$

We have to use the general representation:

$$\mathbf{P}(A, B') = \int \rho_{a,b'}(d\omega) \mathbf{P}(A, B'/a, b', \omega). \quad (2)$$

This blocks the derivation of Bell-type inequalities.

No factorisation. The Bell-Clauser-Horne factorability condition (sometimes called locality condition):

$$\mathbf{P}(A, B'/a, b', \lambda) = \mathbf{P}(A/a, \lambda) \mathbf{P}(B'/b', \lambda) \quad (3)$$

does not hold true. If it is the case, then derivations of Bell-type inequalities are blocked.²

²We remark that (3), in fact, has nothing to do with locality. This is purely probabilistic condition of independence. Nevertheless, it is not so easy to motivate the violation of (3) in the EPR-framework. We shall discuss this problem (in fact, the problem of the right understanding of the statistical independence) in our frequency analysis of the EPR-Bohm experiment.

No probability distribution of hidden variables. It is clear that if probability distributions (measures) of HV do not exist at all, then the derivations of Bell-type inequalities are blocked.³

We notice that we can escape the problem related to contextualism if assume that the simultaneous probability distribution $\rho_{a,b'}(d\omega)$ can be factorized producing, finally, the Bell-Clauser-Horne factorability condition.

Hess-Philipp's contextual probabilistic model. We turn back to works [2]. As we have noticed, we are not interested in the detailed analysis. It is evident that works [2] belong to the class of contextual investigations, see e.g. :

"The essence of our approach is the introduction of setting and station specific time-like parameters as well as time related setting dependent parameters λ_a^* on one side and λ_b^{**} on the other, that codetermine the functions A, B in addition to the correlated source parameters $\lambda...$ We also show that these parameters lead in a natural way to setting dependent probability measures for the parameters without spooky action at a distance," [2].

If we do not pay attention to "time-considerations" (see further analysis of this crucial factor) and restrict us to purely probabilistic considerations, then we simply get a new contextual probabilistic model, Hess-Philipp's model. Moreover, the Bell-Clauser-Horne factorability condition is also violated in Hess-Philipp's model:

"Bell type proofs permit any number and form of parameters as long separate integrations can be performed over the respective densities i.e. if the joint conditional densities equal the product of the individual conditional densities. The introduction of time-like parameters presents then a critical problem since other parameters in the argument of the functions A and B may depend on time," [2]

So, from the first sight Hess-Philipp's model is just one of contextual models with the violation of the Bell-Clauser-Horne factorability condition. It is clear that in such a model Bell's inequality could be violated. However, K. Hess and W. Philipp not only manipulate with contextual probabilistic nonfactorizable distributions, but they also provided the justification of the

³Of course, the reader educated in the framework of the conventional measure-theoretical probability theory (Kolmogorov's axiomatics, 1933) should be surprised. For him, if there is no measure, then there is no probability at all. However, if we leave the domain of Kolmogorov's probability theory and consider e.g. frequency probabilistic model (that is essentially more natural from the experimental viewpoint), then we can find that relative frequencies of observed quantities could stabilize in the absence of the measure-probability for HV, see examples in book [8].

appearance of such distributions by using time-like parameters. And this justification is the crucial point of their investigations.

The role of time in the EPR-Bohm measurements and Hess-Philipp's model. The crucial point of Hess-Philipp's considerations is the recognition of the role of time in the appearance of contextual probabilities and the violation of the Bell-Clauser-Horne factorability condition. Hess and Philipp correctly observed that the sequence of measurements produces a time-like stochastic process. This time structure should be in some way incorporated in the structure of the probability space used to describe these measurements. We could not operate with abstract probability measures as J. Bell and many others, e.g. the authors of [3], did. In particular, by taking into account the time-structure of the process K. Hess and W. Philipp demonstrated that the Bell-Clauser-Horne factorability condition does not look so natural. It could be violated without inducing nonlocality. I think that in general it is the right conclusion.

However, the concrete mechanics [2] inducing this violation does not look so natural and justified in [2]. In [2] there is promoted the point of view that the crucial role is played by time-correlations between processes in measurement devices:

"The core of this demonstration is the mathematical fact that parameters in two stations may be conditionally dependent (e.g. during certain time periods) and simultaneously independent when no condition are imposed." ... " For example, for time periods during which certain time operators are at work and/or certain parameters λ are emitted from the source, the parameters in station S_1 may be correlated to those in station S_2 in other words are conditionally dependent."... "Our station parameters are correlated by clock time ...", [2].

In our frequency analysis we shall present another point of view to the source of violation of the Bell-Clauser-Horne factorability condition. We also consider a sequence of measurements as time-process (by using von Mises theory of collectives). Analysis of this process also implies that the Bell-Clauser-Horne factorability condition should be violated. However, our arguments differ strongly from Hess-Philipp's arguments. Our frequency analysis demonstrated that the Bell-Clauser-Horne factorability condition is violated due to the EPR-correlations. However, before to present our frequency analysis of the EPR-Bell arguments, we would like to turn back to [3].

The choice which an experimenter is free to make in the laboratory. The authors of the paper [3] wrote about Hess-Philipp's investigation: "They (Hess and Philipp) claim that time variables should be included in the

proof but as we show below this is untrue.” I could not totally agree with this. Well, considerations presented in [3] (see also paper [7] on martingal analysis of the EPR-Bell arguments) give the strong arguments against the idea of Hess and Philipp on time correlations between stations S_1 and S_2 . However, I think that the general idea on the crucial role of time in this framework was not discredited in any way by R. Gill, G. Weihs, A. Zeilinger, M. Zukowski arguments. I think that the main problem is that these authors are victims of the convectional formalism of probability theory in that all considerations are performed on the basis of the abstract Kolmogorov probability space.

We also remark that the authors of [3] did strategic mistake in the presentation of anti-Hess-Philipp arguments. In fact, their arguments [3] are merely directed to support classical Bell’s arguments against local realism. In particular, the work [3] contains some proof of Bell’s inequality, see also [7]. The role of this proof in the discussion with K. Hess and W. Philipp is not clear. In fact, this is more or less standard proof of Bell’s inequality based on the use of *counterfactuals*, see e.g. Stapp and Eberhard [9]. Such types of proofs were strongly criticized in quantum community. We would not like go deeply in critical discussions. We simply recall A. Peres: ”Unperformed experiments have no results”. In purely mathematical framework it should be noticed that, in fact, this proof is reduced to the existence of the common Kolmogorov probability space for HV related to different settings of measurement devices, see **Contextualism**. This is Bell’s original assumption. Following to J. Bell, the authors of [3] identify this mathematical assumption with realism. I think that this is the root of the whole Bell-mystification in quantum theory, see [8].

In fact, we have to differ *individual realism* and *statistical realism*. The first one – the existence of objective properties for individual physical systems. The second one – the existence of simultaneous probabilistic distributions for these properties. There are no reasons why individual realism should imply statistical realism, see [8].

Thus in [3] it was rightly pointed out that ”the choice which an experimenter is free to make in the laboratory” should destroy time-correlations promoted in [2]. On the other hand, the general critique of the time-random process approach [2] could not be considered as totally justified. Moreover, it is not clear which role plays in [3] the presentation of the old-fashioned counterfactual proof of Bell’s inequality.

Frequency analysis of the EPR-Bohm experiment. Since a few years, I promote the use in quantum physics of the frequency approach to

probability theory⁴ (developed by R. von Mises) as an alternative to the measure-theoretical approach (developed by A. N. Kolmogorov). The main distinguishing feature of the frequency approach is that here we do not manipulate with abstract probability measures, but with concrete random sequences, *collectives*, produced in various experiments. Even if we move later to probability distributions corresponding to collectives these distributions would have special structures induced by structures of collectives. In particular, von Mises' theory is *contextual* by its nature, since probability distributions should depend on corresponding collectives.

The detailed frequency analysis of the EPR-Bohm experiment was provided in the preprint [10]. Unfortunately, the work [10] was too mathematical and physicists had large difficulties to follow to it. In this letter we present the short summary of this frequency analysis without to go deeply in mathematical details.⁵ The publication of papers [2] and [3] gives the good chance to do this, since there are some similarities in my frequency and Hess-Philipp's time-like correlations approaches. The common point of the frequency and Hess-Philipp's approaches is taking into account the time structure of repetitive preparation and measurement processes in the EPR-Bohm experiments. This gives the possibility to find the internal structure of probabilistic measures used to describe HV in EPR-Bohm experiments.

By taking into account the time factor in both approaches we got contextual probabilistic models without the Bell-Clauser-Horne factorability condition. So the derivation of Bell-like inequalities is blocked. However, despite the common use of the time structure in both approaches, sources of correlations are totally different. As well as the authors of [3], I am quite sceptical to Hess-Philipp's idea on time-like correlations. The frequency analysis pays our attention to totally different source of correlations. In fact, this is the original EPR-source, namely the presence of (ordinary classical) correlations between particles in the EPR-pairs. The crucial point of our analysis is understanding of the fundamental difference in viewpoints to independence in the conventional Kolmogorov probabilistic model and the frequency von

⁴Here probabilities are defined as limits of relative frequencies in long sequences of trials.

⁵There is a rather general opinion that von Mises approach to probability is not justified on the mathematical level of rigorousness. However, this is not the case. Well, original Mises' definition of randomness was not mathematically rigorous. However, it was improved, see e.g. [8] for details. In particular, we can use some restricted classes of place selections (e.g. recursive) to get mathematically correct theory.

Mises model. In the conventional model independence is independence of events. In the frequency model it is independence of collectives. I totally agree with R. von Mises that the frequency viewpoint to independence is essentially more realistic than the event approach⁶.

Mathematically the EPR-Bell story looks very simple from the frequency viewpoint:

Let $\lambda_j, j = 1, 2, \dots$ be the value of the HV for the j th pair of correlated particles (π_j^1, π_j^2) produced at the instance of time $t_j = j$. For settings a and b' , we consider sequences of pairs

$$x_{\omega_a, \lambda} = \{(\omega_{a1}, \lambda_1), \dots, (\omega_{aN}, \lambda_N), \dots\},$$

$$x_{\omega_{b'}, \lambda} = \{(\omega_{b'1}, \lambda_1), \dots, (\omega_{b'N}, \lambda_N), \dots\},$$

and

$$x_{\omega_a, \lambda, \omega_{b'}} = \{(\omega_{a1}, \lambda_1, \omega_{b'1}), \dots, (\omega_{aN}, \lambda_N, \omega_{b'N}), \dots\},$$

where ω_{aj} and $\omega_{b'j}$ are internal states of apparatuses.

The first crucial assumption that was indirectly used by J. Bell and all others supporting him (including the authors of [3]) is that all these sequences are really collectives, i.e. (in particular) limits of relative frequencies in these sequences exist defining limiting **probability distributions**. Well, there are not so many experimental evidences that this is really the case. The only thing that we know from experiment is that frequencies for results of macroscopic measurements stabilize. But why should frequencies for internal microscopic states stabilize? In principle, our macroscopic preparation procedures could violate stabilization of frequencies for HV, so violate the law of large numbers, see [8] for corresponding examples in that macro-stabilization is produced by chaotic micro-fluctuations. In such a case it would be the end of the whole Bell's story. We again recall that J. Bell and all his adherents mixed *individual realism* and *statistical realism*. The absence of probability distributions does not imply the absence of objective (may be contextual) properties.

⁶ See e.g. [8] on discussions and examples demonstrating that "independence-factorisation" of a probability-measure for events could occur just due to mathematical manipulations with numbers. In general, such a factorization has no physical meaning at all. On the other hand, the notion of independence of two experimental collectives has the deep physical meaning.

Well, we assume that all considered sequences of HV are really collectives, so we can freely manipulate with probability distributions used by J. Bell and others. We come now to the fundamental problem of the whole Bell-story:

Are collectives $x_{\omega_a, \lambda}$ and $x_{\omega_{b'}, \lambda}$ independent?

If they are really independent, then we get the factorization of the probability distribution of the collective $x_{\omega_a, \lambda, \omega_{b'}}$ into the product of probability distributions of the collectives $x_{\omega_a, \lambda}$ and $x_{\omega_{b'}, \lambda}$ and, finally, the Bell-Clauser-Horne factorability condition for probabilities. In the opposite case we have no Bell's inequality at all.

However, I do not see any reason why the collectives $x_{\omega_a, \lambda}$ and $x_{\omega_{b'}, \lambda}$ should be independent. Both these collectives contain the same correlation-HV λ . By the original correlations between particles in the EPR-pairs these collectives should be dependent.

Conclusion. *Frequency analysis of the EPR-Bell arguments demonstrated that the Bell-Clauser-Horne factorability condition should be violated due to dependence of collectives on HV of corresponding EPR-pairs. Such violation of the Bell-Clauser-Horne factorisation condition has nothing to do with nonlocality. In particular, frequency analysis simply supports the original EPR-viewpoint that quantum mechanics is not complete theory.*

REFERENCES

- [1] J. S. Bell, *Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics*. Cambridge Univ. Press (1987); J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, R. A. Holt, *Phys. Rev. Letters*, **49**, 1804-1806 (1969); J.F. Clauser, A. Shimony, *Rep. Progr. Phys.*, **41** 1881-1901 (1978). A. Aspect, J. Dalibard, G. Roger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **49**, 1804-1807 (1982).
- [2] Hess K. and Philipp W., *Einstein-separability, time related hidden parameters for correlated spins, and the theorem of Bell*. quant-ph/0103028; *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA*, **98**, 14224 (2001); *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA*, **98**, 14228 (2001); *Europhys. Lett.*, **57**, 775 (2002).
- [3] R. Gill, G. Weihs, A. Zeilinger, M. Zukowski, *Comment on "Exclusion of time in the theorem of Bell" by K. Hess and W. Philipp*. quant-ph/0204169 (2002).
- [4] I. Pitowsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett*, **48**, N.10, 1299-1302 (1982); *Phys. Rev. D*, **27**, N.10, 2316-2326 (1983); S.P. Gudder, *J. Math Phys.*, **25**, 2397- 2401 (1984); L. Accardi, *Urne e Camaleoni: Dialogo sulla realta, le leggi del caso e la teoria quantistica*. Il Saggiatore, Rome (1997); A. Fine, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **48**, 291-295 (1982); P. Rastal, *Found. Phys.*, **13**, 555 (1983). W. Muckenheimer, *Phys. Rep.*, **133**, 338-401 (1986); W. De Baere, *Lett. Nuovo*

Cimento, **39**, 234-238 (1984); **25**, 2397- 2401 (1984); W. De Muynck, J.T. Stekelenborg, *Annalen der Physik*, **45**, N.7, 222-234 (1988).

[5] A. Yu. Khrennikov, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, ser. Matem., **322**, No. 6, 1075–1079 (1992); *J. Math. Phys.*, **32**, No. 4, 932–937 (1991); *Phys. Lett. A*, **200**, 119–223 (1995); *J. Math. Phys.*, **36**, No.12, 6625–6632 (1995); *Phys. Lett., A*, **278**, 307-314 (2001); *J. Math. Phys.*, **41**, 5934-5944(2000); *Il Nuovo Cimento*, **B 115**, 179-184; A.Yu. Khrennikov, *Non-Archimedean analysis: quantum paradoxes, dynamical systems and biological models*. Kluwer Acad.Publ., Dordrecht (1997).

[6] Papers of L. Accardy, G. Adenier, W. De Muynck, D. Gross, S. Gudder, A. Kracklauer, J.-A. Larsson, I. Volovich in *Proc. Conf. "Foundations of Probability and Physics"*, editor A. Khrennikov, WSP, Singapore (2001).

[7] Gill R., quant-ph/0110137 (2001).

[8] Khrennikov A. , *Interpretations of Probability*. VSP Int. Sc. Publishers, Utrecht (1999).

[9] H. P. Stapp, *Phys. Rev., D*, **3**, 1303-1320 (1971); P.H. Eberhard, *Il Nuovo Cimento*, B, **38**, N.1, 75-80(1977); *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **49**, 1474-1477 (1982).

[10] A. Khrennikov, *Einstein and Bell, von Mises and Kolmogorov: reality, locality, frequency and probability*. quant-ph/0006016 (2000).